The Spirit of man is free, and nought adheres to the Spirit.
—*Brihad Aranyaka Upanishad*

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 55 APRIL, 1967 NUMBER 6

THE FIELD OF MAYA

In strict accuracy—to avoid confusion and misconception—the term "Matter" ought to be applied to the aggregate of objects of possible perception, and "Substance" to *noumena;* for inasmuch as the phenomena of *our* plane are the creation of the perceiving Ego—the modifications of its own subjectivity—all the "states of matter representing the aggregate of perceived objects" can have but a relative and purely phenomenal existence for the children of our plane.

—*The Secret Doctrine* I, 329

IF, then, the panorama of perception is the creation of the incarnated ego, by what means does that ego develop the focus which defines what it sees and regards as "real"? *The Secret Doctrine* is clear on this also: "Whatever plane our consciousness may be acting in, both we and the things belonging to that plane are, for the time being, our only realities." This passage (I, 40) goes on to say that as we rise from plane to plane, we see that "during the stages through which we have passed we mistook shadows for realities, and the upward progress of the Ego is a series of progressive awakenings, each advance bringing with it the idea that now, at last, we have reached 'reality'," and that emancipation from this parade of illusions will be reached only when absolute Consciousness is gained, and then, blending with it, we shall be "free from the delusions produced by Maya."

What sets the scene of all these passing "realities"? It is by asking this question that we come upon the crucial importance of the doc-

trine of cycles. For cycles, as understood, for example, in terms of the teaching of the rounds and races, mark off the enormous epochs in which the ego is subjected to the different qualifications of matter, perceived through the various organs of perception with which man is endowed. "The Round," as said in *The Ocean of Theosophy,* "is a circling of the seven centers of planetary consciousness; the Race the racial development on one of those seven." The cosmic Elements and the human senses develop along parallel lines: "As seen, each Element adds to its own characteristics, those of its predecessor; as each Root-Race adds to the characterizing sense of the preceding Race." This is a universal rule: "The same is true in the *septenary* creation of man, who evolves gradually in seven stages, and on the same principles. . . ." (*S.D.* II, 107-8.)

A little further on, not the technical process but the moral and spiritual drama of these changes is described:

> Thus, as we shall find, for the first three and a half Root-Races, up to the middle or turning point, it is the astral shadows of the "progenitors," the lunar Pitris, which are the formative powers in the Races, and which build and gradually force the evolution of the physical form towards perfection—this, at the cost of a proportionate loss of spirituality. Then, from the turning point, it is the Higher Ego, or incarnating principle, the *nous* or *Mind,* which reigns over the animal Ego, and rules it whenever it is not carried down by the latter. In short, Spirituality is on its ascending arc, and the animal or physical impedes it from steadily progressing on the path of its evolution only when the selfishness of the *personality* has so strongly infected the real *inner* man with its lethal *virus,* that the upward attraction has lost all its power on the thinking reasonable man. In sober truth, vice and wickedness are an *abnormal, unnatural* manifestation, at this period of our human evolution—at least they ought to be so. The fact that mankind was never more selfish and vicious than it is now, civilized nations having succeeded in making of the first an ethical characteristic, of the second an art, is an additional proof of the exceptional nature of the phenomenon. (II, 110.)

Here we have set out in precise terms the confrontation of human experience in the present evolutionary cycle, with some hints as to the paradoxes and self-deceptions that may be expected to present themselves as illusory, self-serving explanations of what is, metaphysically speaking, a transitory and impermanent scene.

Selfishness as an "ethical characteristic" is to be found in the justification of policies of "national interest" by all the great powers

of the present, and the celebration of ruthless acquisitiveness in commerce and industry as a demonstration of manly virtue is a further illustration of this attitude. Present-day literature, and not only the vulgar, popular kind, is filled with examples of "æsthetic" appreciations of vice, whether it is found in Sartre's strange championship of the work of Genet or the equally disturbing admiration of some of the little magazines for the writing of William Burroughs. The inversions and moral confusions to be expected in Kali Yuga doubtless account, in some instances, for what seems the obliteration of any last trace of distinction between good and evil in the arts, while an angry puritanism, on the other hand, spoils with self-righteousness a criticism which would be more persuasive if it were able to measure the extent to which its own dogmatism is responsible for the very rebellions against "morality" that so bewilder and affront the older generation.

Fashions in egotism move from one Kama-manasic theme to another, and the basic separativeness in these expressions harbors a latent violence that comes out, periodically, in nihilist revolutions, and these call up an opposition which is hardly morally superior in its expedient political motives and ruthlessly destructive course. These are the surface agonies of Kali Yuga, and they are rooted in conjunctions of the psychic principles of man's nature which ought long since, as H.P.B. points out, to have loosened and given way to the inclinations of a higher evolution.

The work of the present cycle is plain enough, in terms of the Theosophical teaching. It is to exert a transforming influence in behalf of the emerging but laggard Buddhi-Manas of the race; it is to stir and evoke the strength of an awakening individuality. Mr. Judge put it clearly in one of his letters, written many years ago:

> The race is as a whole in a transition state and many of its units are kept back by the condition of the whole. We find the path difficult, because, being of the race, the general race-tendencies very strongly affect us. This we cannot do away with in a moment. It is useless to groan over it; it is also selfish, since we in the distant past had a hand in making it what it now is. The only way we can alter it is by such action now as makes of each one a centre for good, a force that makes "for righteousness," and is guided by wisdom. From the great power of the general badness, we each one have a greater fight to wage the moment we force our inner nature up beyond the dead level of the world. So, before we attempt that forcing, we should

on the lower plane accumulate all that we can of merit by unselfish acts, by kind thoughts, by detaching our minds from the allurements of the world. This will not throw us out of the world, but will make us free from the great force which is called by Bœhme the "Turba," by which he meant the immense power of the unconscious and material basis of our nature. That material base being devoid of soul is more inclined on this plane to the lower things of life than to the higher.

Apart from the occult meaning of the "unconscious and material basis of our nature"—a large subject in itself—this foundation of physical and sensuous "reality" is precisely the evolutionary field of the present cycle, created by the organs of sense which claim so great a proportion of our attention, and which, because of our involvement, we are inclined in unreflective moments to declare to be *real*. Here we have the paradox of all human struggle toward enlightenment—the need to recognize as unreal the very instruments of perception we have evolved through long ages in order to participate in the great evolutionary journey. H.P.B. gives an ancient form of this paradox, quoting the *Anugita* (*S.D.* I, 87):

"Thus these *seven* (senses, smell and taste, and colour, and sound, etc., etc.) are the causes of emancipation"; and the commentator adds: "It is from these seven from which the Self is to be emancipated. 'I' (am here devoid of qualities) must mean the Self, not the Brahmana who speaks."

So, even as one works in the world and uses his senses for practical tasks, he has need for that bifocal philosophical vision which enables him to say to himself that the "real" for which he longs is to be found on higher planes. Even as the parent or teacher will enter into the games and play of children, but not become emotionally involved, so the ego may "work as those work who are ambitious," reserving an inner awareness of the vast sweep of phenomenal existence, and knowledge that the psychically involved "real" of today will not be real tomorrow. So will he free himself of the pains of self-identification with the ways of the world as it is now, and give help and hope to less stable souls who are in danger of being engulfed by the waves of fear and passion. The over-all philosophical position is put by H.P.B.:

From the stand-point of the highest metaphysics, the whole Universe, gods included, is an illusion: but the illusion of him who is himself an illusion differs on every plane of consciousness; and we have no more right to dogmatise about the possible perceptive faculties of an Ego on, say, the sixth plane, than we

> have to identify our perceptions with, or make them a standard for, those of an ant, in *its* mode of consciousness.

This passage is chastening, to say the least, to any fixed idea about "reality." But how does this help us in practical terms? We may assume, if we accept H.P.B. as teacher, that there is an educational necessity for beginning to think of ourselves in terms of pure egoity, during this cycle of accelerated change. The very character of the changes now taking place would naturally define the level of self-consciousness required for passing through them successfully. "Hold fast to that which has neither substance nor existence" may be a rule for one about to become an adept, but it is also a principle with appropriate application for weathering any storm. But in shaky and perilous times, to what can imperfect men have recourse? What shall be the foundation when the earth itself is held to be no more than a temporary vapor, and our senses the magic lantern which lends transitory reality to a focus of external being?

Such questions lead directly to recognition of the continuous support found in the moral states of being. These are constants, whatever the changing scene. We are told, again and again, that the moral sense of reality is a *generated* awareness, formed from the day-to-day strivings of human beings to see themselves in their brothers, and their brothers in themselves. Hence the primary emphasis of the Theosophical movement on Brotherhood and altruism—attitudes and activities which seek the substance of reality behind the phantasmagoria of sense and the ever-changing alterations of form. Fear and insecurity cannot live in the presence of authentic love for one's fellows, and this devotion survives on earth not as an abstract principle, but in the manifested form of *work*. So, finally, as Mr. Judge has said:

> We are working for the new cycles and centuries. What we do now in this transition age will be like what the great Dhyan Chohans did in the transition point—the midway point in evolution—at the time when all matter and all types were in a transition and fluid state. They then gave the impulse for the new types, which resulted later in all the vast varieties of nature. In mental development we are now at the same point; and what we do now in faith and hope for others, and for ourselves, will result similarly on the plane to which it is all directed. Thus in other centuries we will come out again and go on with it. If we neglect it now, so much the worse for us then. Hence we are not working for some definite organization of the new years to come, but for a change in the Manas and the Buddhi of the Race. That

is why it may seem indefinite, but it is, nevertheless, very defined and very great in scope. (*Letters That Have Helped Me* II, 72.)

THE UNIVERSAL SURGE OF LIFE

In a world of illusion in which the law of evolution operates, nothing could be more natural than that the ideals of MAN—as a unit of total, or mankind—should be forever shifting. A part of the Nature around him, that Protean, ever-changing Nature, every particle of which is incessantly transformed, while the harmonious body remains as a whole ever the same, like these particles man is continually changing, physically, intellectually, morally, spiritually. At one time he is at the topmost point of the circle of development; at another, at the lowest. And, as he thus alternately rises and sinks, and his moral nature responsively expands or contracts, so will his moral code at one time embody the noblest altruistic and aspirational ideals, while at the other, the ruling conscience will be but the reflection of selfishness, brutality and faithlessness. But this, however, is so only on the external, illusionary plane. In their internal, or rather *essential* constitution, both nature and man are at one, as their essence is identical. All grows and develops and strives toward perfection on the former planes of externality or, as well said by a philosopher, is—"ever becoming"; but on the ultimate plane of the spiritual essence all Is, and remains therefore immutable. It is toward this eternal *Esse* that every thing, as every being, is gravitating, gradually, almost imperceptibly, but as surely as the Universe of stars and worlds moves towards a mysterious point known to, yet still unnamed by, astronomy, and called by the Occultists—the *central Spiritual Sun*.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

WHAT IS THEOSOPHY?

A SERIES of definitions of Theosophy, supplied by "A Paramahansa of the Himalayas," was published in the *Theosophist* for August, 1882. The accompanying editorial note read: "*Paramahansas* are the order of the highest Yogi-Sannyasis, who alone are allowed to throw off the yoke of the Hindu caste superstitions. While all the others have to perform, more or less, the daily exoteric ceremonies of their respective *Ashrums* or orders, no rules of action can be assigned to these." (H.P.B.'s two footnotes are here placed within brackets.) The definitions follow:

1. Theosophy is that branch of human perfection, by which one may establish himself with the eternal cause of invisible nature; to which this physical effect is a visible bubble.

2. Theosophy is that knowledge which leads one from animalism to Divinity.

3. Theosophy is that branch of human philosophy, which theoretically teaches one what he really is beyond *mind and personal individuality* (Ego).

4. Theosophy is that branch of chemistry, by which one begets IMMORTALITY.

5. Theosophy is that branch of painting (one's self) which Time cannot efface.

6. Theosophy is that branch of husbandry (agriculture) by which one may preserve the seed without rearing the tree.

7. Theosophy is that branch of optics, which magnifies one's view to see beyond physical nature.

8. Theosophy is that branch of human surgery, which separates physical nature from the spiritual.

9. Theosophy is that branch of Masonry, which shows the universe in an egg.

10. Theosophy is that branch of music, which harmonises physical nature with spirit.

11. Theosophy is that part of gardening, which teaches one how to rear trees out of charcoal.

12. Theosophy is that branch of sanitation, which teaches one how to purify nature by means of cause and effect.

13. Theosophy is that branch of engineering, which bridges the gulf between life and death.

14. Theosophy is that warlike art, which teaches one how to subdue (subjugate) time and death, the two mightiest foes of man.

15. Theosophy is that food, which enables one to taste the most exquisite sweetness in his own self.

16. Theosophy is that branch of navigation, which teaches one the starting point and the final goal of human life.

17. Theosophy is that branch of commerce, which makes one fit to select unerringly the commodities for both lives.

18. Theosophy is that branch of politics, which unites past and future into one present, and establishes peace with the most tumultuous off-shoots of debased nature.

19. Theosophy is that branch of mineralogy, by which one may discover the source of eternal wealth, combining life, knowledge and eternal joy into one.

20. Theosophy is that branch of astronomy, which proves that spirit is the only fixed star which sets not throughout the revolutions of nature.

21. Theosophy is that branch of gymnastics, which invigorates the mind, expands the intellect, unites the thought *with the tie of breath* [this relates to occult practice], removes the heat of lust, and produces a balmy calmness, which is the heart's eye, to penetrate the mysteries of nature.

22. Theosophy is that branch of mental philosophy, by which one may know the exact centre of his individual Self and its identity with the entity of the second principle of the Vedantists, or the seventh one of the present Theosophists [*Jivatma,* in the sense of the Vedantin, is the Soul of all life, and in that of the Theosophists it is *Jiva*—vital principle], or what is commonly known by the name, God.

23. Theosophy is that branch of medicine by which one may rid himself of his sins from time immemorial.

24. Theosophy is that branch of natural philosophy, by which one may watch and witness nature in her birth—chastity—*adultery* and the present old age.

25. Theosophy is that occult branch of the Christian church, on which the groundwork of that church was originally planned,—*i.e.*, the essential non-difference of God with the individual witness.

26. Theosophy is that branch of Christianity, which eliminates the spiritual Christ from the corporeal one of the orthodox generation.

27. Theosophy is that part of the Christian theology, which shows that the present churches of the West are abusing the Bible by misinterpretations.

28. Theosophy is that part of the Aryan independence, by which one may exist without the help of nature.

29. Theosophy (to be brief) is the sum total of the wisdom of the Aryan Brahma—the happiest eternal—and the life everlasting. It is Theosophy which taught the Aryans how to soar far beyond the region of Shakti and to be in *perpetual joy*—(the playground of Shakti). In short, it is the basis of all the knowledge that exists in the eternity.

—A PARAMAHANSA

PHILOSOPHY OF ACTION

Theosophy is the only philosophy that can be used in every direction in daily life. It can be used in all directions, high or low, because that use comes from an understanding of the Spirit itself, from acting for that Self and as that Self—for the Self acts only through the creatures. Acting for and as that Self in every direction, all else flows into line. All the destruction that is around us, all the misery that we see, has been brought about through our denial of the Holy Ghost—our denial of the Spirit within us. We deny it when we act as if we are our bodies, or our minds. THAT *will not be denied.* So man, meeting all the results of that denial and seeing them to be evil, learns that this is not the way. Then he seeks for Truth, and finding the truth, obtains all that he can desire. It was to give to men all they could take in regard to the nature of the soul that those Beings known as Divine Incarnations have descended here of Their own will. They have carried forward from age to age this knowledge of nature and of man and of the purpose of life, learned through many civilizations of mankind.

—ROBERT CROSBIE

THE WISDOM RELIGION

The Mysteries V

NO more than any other scripture of the great world-religions can the Bible be excluded from that class of allegorical and symbolical writings which have been, from the pre-historic ages, the receptacle of the secret teachings of the Mysteries of Initiation, under a more or less veiled form. The primitive writers of the *Logia* (now the Gospels) knew certainly *the* truth, and the *whole* truth; but their successors had, as certainly, only dogma and form, which lead to hierarchical power at heart, rather than the spirit of the so-called Christ's teachings.

Nevertheless, TRUTH has not allowed herself to remain without witnesses. There are, besides great Initiates into scriptural symbology, a number of quiet students of the mysteries of archaic esotericism, of scholars proficient in Hebrew and other dead tongues, who have devoted their lives to unriddle the speeches of the Sphinx of the world-religions. And these students, though none of them has yet mastered all the "seven keys" that open the great problem, have discovered enough to be able to say: There *was* a universal mystery-language, in which all the World Scriptures were written, from *Vedas* to "Revelation," from the "Book of the Dead" to the *Acts*. One of the keys, at any rate—the numerical and geometrical key[1] to the Mystery Speech is now rescued; an ancient language, truly, which up to this time remained hidden, but the evidences of which abundantly exist, as may be proven by undeniable mathematical demonstrations. If, indeed, the Bible is forced on the acceptance of the world in its dead-letter meaning, in the face of the modern discoveries by Orientalists and the efforts of independent

---

NOTE.—"The Wisdom Religion" began in the November, 1966, issue. This installment, the last on "The Mysteries," comprises extracts from "The Esoteric Character of the Gospels," by H. P. Blavatsky. This three-part article was first published in *Lucifer* for November, December, 1887, and February, 1888; and was reprinted in Volume IV of THEOSOPHY.

[1] "The key to the recovery of the language, so far as the writer's efforts have been concerned, was found in the use, strange to say, of the discovered integral ratio in numbers of diameter to circumference of a circle," by a geometrician. "This ratio is 6,561 for diameter and 20,612 for circumference." (Cabalistic MSS.)

students and kabalists, it is easy to prophesy that even the present new generations of Europe and America will repudiate it, as all the materialists and logicians have done. For, the more one studies ancient religious texts, the more one finds that the ground-work of the New Testament is the same as the ground-work of the Vedas, of the Egyptian theogony, and the Mazdean allegories. The atonements by blood—blood-covenants and blood-transferences from gods to men, and by men, as sacrifices to the gods—are the first keynote struck in every cosmogony and theogony; soul, life and blood were synonymous words in every language, pre-eminently with the Jews; and that blood-giving was life-giving. Lenormant has shown (*Beginnings of History,* p. 52, note) that "the Orphics . . . said that the *immaterial part of man, his soul* (his life) sprang from the blood of Dionysius Zagreus, whom . . . Titans tore to pieces." Blood "revivifies the dead"—*i.e.*, interpreted metaphysically, it gives *conscious* life and a soul to the man of matter or clay —such as the modern materialist is now. The mystic meaning of the injunction. "Verily I say unto you, except *ye eat the flesh* of the Son of man and *drink his blood,* ye have not life in yourselves," etc., can never be understood or appreciated at its true *occult* value, except by those who hold some of the *seven keys,* and yet care little for St. Peter.[2]

The first key that one has to use to unravel the dark secrets involved in the mystic name of Christ, is the key which unlocked the door to the ancient mysteries of the primitive Aryans, Sabeans and Egyptians. The Gnosis supplanted by the Christian scheme was universal. It was the echo of the primordial wisdom-religion which had once been the heirloom of the whole of mankind; and, therefore, one may truly say that, in its purely metaphysical aspect, the Spirit of Christ (the divine *logos*) was present in humanity

---

[2] The existence of these *seven* keys is virtually admitted, owing to deep research in the Egyptological lore, by Mr. G. Massey. While opposing the teachings of "Esoteric Buddhism"—unfortunately misunderstood by him in almost every respect—in his Lecture on "The Seven Souls of Man," he writes (p. 21):

"This system of thought, this mode of representation. this septenary of powers, in various aspects, had been established in Egypt, at least, seven thousand years ago, as we learn from certain allusions to Atma (the god 'in whom the fatherhood was individualised as the *begetter of an eternal soul,*' (the *seventh* principle of the Theosophists), found in the inscriptions lately discovered at Sakkarah. I say in various aspects, *because the gnosis of the Mysteries was, at least sevenfold in its nature*—it was Elemental, Biological, Elementary (human), Stellar, Lunar, Solar and Spiritual—and *nothing short of a grasp of the whole system can possibly enable us to discriminate the various parts, distinguish one from the other, and determine the which and the what, as we try to follow the symbolical Seven through their several phases of character.*"

from the beginning of it. The author of the Clementine Homilies is right; the mystery of Christos—now supposed to have been taught by Jesus of Nazareth—"was identical" with that which *from the first* had been communicated *"to those who were worthy."* We may learn from the Gospel *according* to Luke, that the "worthy" were those who had been initiated into the mysteries of the Gnosis, and who were "accounted worthy" to attain that "resurrection from the dead" *in this life* . . . "those who knew that they could die no more, being equal to the angels as sons of God and sons of the Resurrection." In other words, they were the great adepts *of whatever religion;* and the words apply to all those who, without being Initiates, strive and succeed, through personal efforts to *live the life* and to attain the naturally ensuing spiritual illumination in blending their personality—the ("Son") with (the "Father,") their individual divine Spirit, *the God within* them. This "resurrection" can never be monopolized by the Christians, but is the spiritual birth-right of every human being endowed with soul and spirit, whatever his religion may be. Such individual is a *Christ-man*. On the other hand, those who choose to ignore the Christ (principle) within themselves, must die *unregenerate heathens*—baptism, sacraments, lip-prayers, and belief in dogmas notwithstanding.

In order to follow this explanation, the reader must bear in mind the real archaic meaning of the paronomasia involved in the two terms *Chréstos* and *Christos*. The former means certainly more than merely "a good," an "excellent man," while the latter was never applied to any one living man, but to every Initiate at the moment of *his second birth and resurrection.*[3] He who finds Christos within himself and recognizes the latter as his only "way," becomes a follower and an *Apostle of Christ*, though he may have never been baptised, nor even have met a "Christian," still less call himself one.

The word Chréstos existed ages before Christianity was heard of. It is found used, from the fifth century B.C., by Herodotus, by Æschylus and other classical Greek writers, the meaning of it being applied to both things and persons. The terms Christ and Christians, spelt originally *Chrést* and *Chréstians* (Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Lactantius, Clemens Alexandrinus, and others spelt it in this

[3] "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man *be born again* he cannot see the Kingdom of God." (John 3:4.) Here the birth *from above*, the spiritual birth, is meant, achieved at the supreme and last initiation.

way), were directly borrowed from the Temple terminology of the Pagans, and meant the same thing. The secular meaning of *Chréstos* runs throughout the classical Greek literature *pari passu* with that given to it in the mysteries. Demosthenes . . . means by it, "you nice fellow"; Plato . . . "you are an excellent fellow to think. . . ." But in the esoteric phraseology of the temples "chréstos" . . . answers to what we would call an adept, also a high *chela,* a disciple. It is in this sense that it is used by Euripides and by Æschylus.

It is not what the early Fathers, who had an object to achieve, may affirm or deny, that is the important point, but rather what is now the evidence for the real significance given to the two terms *Chréstos* and *Christos* by the ancients in the pre-Christian ages. For the latter had no object to achieve, therefore nothing to conceal or disfigure, and their evidence is naturally the more reliable of the two. This evidence can be obtained by first studying the meaning given to these words by the classics, and then their correct significance searched for in mystic symbology.

Now *Chréstos,* as already said, is a term applied in various senses. It qualifies both Deity and Man. It is used in the former sense in the Gospels, and in Luke (6:35), where it means "kind," and "merciful," [and] in I Peter (2:3), where it is "kind is the Lord." On the other hand, it is explained by Clemens Alexandrinus as simply meaning a good man; *i.e.,* "All who believe in *Chrést* (a good man) both *are,* and *are called Chréstians,* that is good men." The reticence of Clemens, whose Christianity, as King truly remarks in his *Gnostics,* was no more than a graft upon the congenial stock of his original Platonism, is quite natural. He was an Initiate, a new Platonist, before he became a Christian, which fact, however much he may have fallen off from his earlier views, could not exonerate him from his pledge of secrecy. And as a Theosophist and a *Gnostic,* one who *knew,* Clemens must have known that *Christos* was "the Way," while *Chréstos* was the lonely traveller journeying on to reach the ultimate goal through that "Path," which goal was *Christos,* the glorified Spirit of "TRUTH," the reunion with which makes the soul (the Son) ONE with the (Father) Spirit. That Paul knew it, is certain, for his own expressions prove it. For what do the words "I am again in travail until *Christ be formed in you*" mean, but what we give in its esoteric rendering, *i.e.,* "until you find *the* Christos within yourselves as your only 'way'." (Gal. 4:19-20.)

Thus Jesus, whether of Nazareth or Lüd,[4] was a Chréstos, as undeniably as that he never was entitled to the appellation of *Christos,* during his lifetime and before his last trial. A number of ancient writers may be brought forward to testify that *Christos* (or *Chreistos,* rather) was, along with Hrésos, an adjective applied to Gentiles before the Christian era. Christos, or the "Christ-condition," was ever the synonym of the "Mahatmic-condition," *i.e.,* the union of the man with the divine principle in him. As Paul says (Ephes. 3:17), "That you may find Christos in your *inner* man through *knowledge"* not faith, as translated; for *Pistis* is "knowledge."

There is still another and far more weighty proof that the name *Christos* is pre-Christian. The evidence for it is found in the prophecy of the Erythrean Sybil. Read exoterically, the words *"Iesous Chreistos theou yios soter stauros,"* meaning literally "Iesus, Christos, God, Son, Saviour, Cross," are most excellent handles to hang a Christian prophecy on, but they are *pagan,* not Christian. Read esoterically, this string of meaningless detached nouns, which has no sense to the profane, contains a real prophecy—only not referring to Jesus—and a verse from the mystic catechism of the Initiate. The prophecy relates to the coming down upon the Earth of the Spirit of Truth (Christos), after which advent—that had once more nought to do with Jesus—will begin the Golden Age; the verse refers to the necessity before reaching that blessed condition of inner (or subjective) theophany and theopneusty, to pass through the crucifixion of flesh or matter.

If called upon to explain the names IESOUS CHREISTOS, the answer is: study mythology, the so-called "fictions" of the ancients, and they will give you the key. Ponder over Apollo, the solar god, and the "Healer," and the allegory about his son Janus (or Ion), his priest at Delphos, through whom alone could prayers reach the immortal gods, and his other son Asclepios, called the *Soter,* or Saviour.

---

[4] Or Lydda. Reference is made here to the Rabbinical tradition in the Babylonian Gemara, called *Sepher Toledoth Jeshu,* about Jesus being the son of one named Pandira, and having lived a century earlier than the era called Christian, namely, during the reign of the Jewish king Alexander Jannæus and his wife Salome, who reigned from the year 106 to 79 B.C. Accused by the Jews of having learned the magic art in Egypt, and of having stolen from the Holy of Holies the Incommunicable Name, Jehoshua (Jesus) was put to death by the Sanhedrin at Lud. He was stoned and then crucified on a tree, on the eve of Passover. The narrative is ascribed to the Talmudistic authors of "Sota" and "Sanhedrin," p. 19, Book of Zechiel. See *Isis Unveiled* II, 201; Eliphas Levi's *Science des Esprits* and "The Historical Jesus and Mythical Christ," a lecture by G. Massey.

Occultism pure and simple finds the same mystic elements in the Christian as in other faiths, though it rejects as emphatically its dogmatic and *historic* character. Still, the personage (Jesus) so addressed—whenever he lived—was a great Initiate and a "Son of God."

The surname Christos is based on, and the story of the Crucifixion derived from events that preceded it. Everywhere, in India as in Egypt, in Chaldea as in Greece, all these legends were built upon one and the same primitive type; the voluntary sacrifice of the *logoï* —the *rays* of the one LOGOS, the direct manifested emanation from the One ever-concealed Infinite and Unknown—whose *rays* incarnated in mankind. They consented to *fall into matter,* and are, therefore, called the "Fallen Ones."

* * *

> "Tell us, when shall these things be? And what shall be the sign *of thy presence,* and *of the consummation of the age?*"[5] asked the Disciples of the MASTER, on the Mount of Olives.

The reply given by the "Man of Sorrow," the *Chréstos,* on his trial, but also on his way to triumph, as *Christos,* or Christ,[6] is prophetic, and very suggestive. It is a warning indeed. The answer must be quoted in full. Jesus . . . said unto them:

> Take heed that *no man* lead you astray. For many shall come in my name saying, I am the Christ; and shall lead many astray. And ye shall hear of wars . . . but the end is not yet. *For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; and there shall be famines and earthquakes in divers places.* But all these things are the beginning of travail. . . . Many false prophets shall arise, and shall lead many astray. . . . Then shall the end come . . . when ye see the abomination of desolation which was spoken through Daniel. . . . Then if any man shall say unto you, *Lo, here is the Christ,* or There! believe him not. . . . If they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the wilderness, go not forth; behold, he is in the inner chambers, believe them not. For as the lightning cometh forth from the East, and is seen even in the West, so shall be the *presence* of the Son of Man.

---

[5] St. Matthew 24:3, *et seq.* The sentences italicised are those which stand corrected in the New Testament after the recent revision in 1881 of the version of 1611, which version is full of errors, voluntary and involuntary. The word "presence," for "coming," and "the consummation of the age," now standing for "the end of the world," have altered, of late, the whole meaning, even for the most sincere Christians, if we except the Adventists.

[6] He who will not ponder over and master the great difference between the meaning of the two Greek words—Chréstos and Christos—must remain blind forever to the true esoteric meaning of the Gospels; that is to say, to the living Spirit entombed in the sterile dead-letter of the texts, the very Dead Sea fruit of *lip*-Christianity.

Two things become evident *to all* in the above passages, now that their false rendering is corrected in the revision text: (*a*) "the coming of Christ," means *the presence* of CHRISTOS in a regenerated world, and not at all the actual coming in body of "Christ" Jesus; (*b*) this Christ is to be sought neither in the wilderness nor "in the inner chambers," nor in the sanctuary of any temple or church built by man; for Christ—the true esoteric SAVIOUR—*is no man,* but the DIVINE PRINCIPLE in every human being. He who strives to resurrect the Spirit *crucified in him by his own terrestrial passions,* and buried deep in the "sepulchre" of his sinful flesh; he who has the strength to roll back *the stone of matter* from the door of his own *inner* sanctuary, he *has the risen Christ in him.*[7] The "Son of Man" is no child of the bondwoman—*flesh,* but verily of the free-woman —*Spirit,* the child of man's own deeds, and the fruit of his own spiritual labour. (Spirit, or the Holy Ghost, was feminine with the Jews, as with most ancient peoples, and it was so with the early Christians. *Sophia* of the Gnostics, and the third Sephiroth *Binah* [the *female* Jehovah of the Kabalists], are feminine principles—"Divine Spirit," or *Ruach. "Achath Ruach Elohim Chiim."* "One is *She,* the Spirit of the Elohim of Life," is said in "Sepher Yezirah.")

Theosophists were never found saying that Christ is "Here" or "There," in wilderness or city, and least of all in the "inner chamber" behind the altar of any modern church. Whether Heathen or Christian by birth, they refuse to materialise and thus degrade that which is the purest and grandest ideal—the symbol of symbols—namely, the immortal Divine Spirit in man, whether it be called Horus, Krishna, Buddha, or Christ.

The "Christ principle," the awakened and glorified Spirit of Truth, being universal and eternal, the true *Christos* cannot be monopolized by any one person, even though that person has chosen to arrogate to himself the title of the "Vicar of Christ," or of the "Head" of that or another State-religion. The spirits of "Chrést" and "Christ" cannot be confined to any creed or sect, only because that sect chooses to exalt itself above the heads of all other religions or sects. The name has been used in a manner so intolerant and dogmatic, especially in our day, that Christianity is now the religion of arrogance *par excellence*, a steppingstone for ambition, a sinecure

[7] For ye are the temple ("sanctuary" in the *revised* N.T.) of the living God. (II Cor. 6:16.)

for wealth, sham and power; a convenient screen for hypocrisy.

To the true follower of the SPIRIT OF TRUTH, it matters little, therefore, whether Jesus, as man and Chréstos, lived during the era called Christian, or before, or never lived at all. The Adepts, who lived and died for humanity, have existed in many and all the ages, and many were the good and holy men in antiquity who bore the surname or title of Chréstos before Jesus of Nazareth, otherwise Jesus (or Jehoshua) Ben Pandira was born. (Several classics bear testimony to this fact.) Therefore, one may be permitted to conclude, with good reason, that Jesus, or Jehoshua, was like Socrates, like Phocian, like Theodorus, and so many others surnamed *Chréstos, i.e.,* the "good, the excellent," the gentle, and the holy Initiate, who showed the "way" to the Christos condition, and thus became himself "the Way" in the hearts of his enthusiastic admirers. The Christians, as all "Hero-worshippers" have tried to throw into the background all the other Chréstoï, who have appeared to them as rivals of *their* Man-God. But if the voice of the MYSTERIES has become silent for many ages in the West, if Eleusis, Memphis, Antium, Delphi, and Crèsa have long ago been made the tombs of a Science once as colossal in the West as it is yet in the East, there are successors now being prepared for them. We are in 1887 and the nineteenth century is close to its death. The twentieth century has strange developments in store for humanity, and may even be the last of its name.

Belief in the Bible *literally,* and in a *carnalised* Christ, will not last a quarter of a century longer. The Churches will have to part with their cherished dogmas, or the twentieth century will witness the downfall and ruin of all Christendom, and with it, belief even in a Christos, as pure Spirit. The very name has now become obnoxious, and theological Christianity must die out, *never to resurrect again* in its present form. This, in itself, would be the happiest solution of all, were there no danger from the natural reaction which is sure to follow: crass materialism will be the consequence and the result of centuries of blind faith, unless the loss of old ideals is replaced by other ideals, unassailable, because *universal,* and built on the rock of eternal truths instead of the shifting sands of human fancy.

No man, once he devotes himself to such comparative studies, can regard the religion of the West in any light but that of a pale and enfeebled copy of older and nobler philosophies. The origin of all religions—Judaeo-Christianity included—is to be found in a

few primeval truths, not one of which can be explained apart from all the others, as each is a complement of the rest in some one detail. And they are all, more or less, broken rays of the same Sun of truth, and their beginnings have to be sought in the archaic records of the Wisdom-religion.

Whence, then, the Gospels, the life of Jesus of Nazareth? Has it not been repeatedly stated that no human, *mortal* brain could have invented the life of the Jewish Reformer, followed by the awful drama on Calvary? We say, on the authority of the esoteric Eastern School, and all this came from the Gnostics, as far as the name Christos and the astronomico-mystical allegories are concerned, and from the writings of the ancient Tanaïm as regards the Kabalistic connection of Jesus or Joshua, with the Biblical personifications.

The Gnostic Records contained the epitome of the chief scenes enacted during the mysteries of Initiation, since the memory of man; though even that was given out invariably under the garb of semi-allegory, whenever entrusted to parchment or paper. But the ancient Tanaïm, the Initiates from whom the wisdom of the Kabala (*oral tradition*) was obtained by the later Talmudists, had in their possession the secrets of the mystery language, and it is *in this language that the Gospels* were written.[8] He alone who has mastered the esoteric cypher of antiquity—the secret meaning of the numerals, a common property at one time of all nations—has the full proof of the genius which was displayed in the blending of the purely Egypto-Jewish, Old Testament allegories and names, and those of the pagan-Greek Gnostics, the most refined of all the mystics of that day.

The Christian application of the compound name Jesus-Christ is all based on Gnostic and Eastern mysticism. It was only right and natural that Chroniclers like the initiated Gnostics, pledged to secrecy, should veil or *cloak* the final meaning of their oldest and most sacred teachings. The right of the Church fathers to cover the whole with an epitheme of euhemerized fancy is rather more dubious.[9] The Gnostic Scribe and Chronicler deceived no one. Every

---

[8] Thus while the three Synoptics display a combination of the pagan Greek and Jewish symbologies the *Revelation* is written in the mystery language of the Tanaïm—the relic of Egyptian and Chaldean wisdom—and St. John's Gospel is purely Gnostic.

[9] "The claim of Christianity to possess Divine authority rests on the ignorant belief that the mystical Christ could and did become a Person, whereas the gnosis proves the corporeal Christ to be only a counterfeit Presentment of the trans-corporeal man; conse-

Initiate into the Archaic gnosis—whether of the pre-Christian or post-Christian period—knew well the value of every word of the "mystery language." For these Gnostics—the inspirers of primitive Christianity—were "the most cultured, the most learned and most wealthy of the Christian name," as Gibbon has it. Neither they, nor their humbler followers, were in danger of accepting the dead letter of their own texts.

Paul was a gnostic, a founder of a new sect of *gnosis* which recognized, as all other gnostic sects did, a "Christ-Spirit," though it went against its opponents, the rival sects, is sufficiently clear to all but dogmatists and theologians. Nor is it less clear that the primitive teachings of Jesus, whenever he may have lived, could be discovered only in Gnostic teachings; against which discovery, the falsifiers who dragged down Spirit into matter, thus degrading the noble philosophy of primeval Wisdom-Religion, have taken ample precautions from the first. The works of Basilides alone—"The philosopher devoted to the contemplation of Divine things," as Clement describes him—the twenty-four volumes of his *interpretations upon the Gospels*—were all burned by order of the Church.

Another proof of the claim that the Gospel of Matthew in the usual Greek texts is not the original gospel written in Hebrew, is given by no less an authority than S. Jerome (or Hieronymus). The suspicion of a conscious and gradual *euhemerization* of the Christ principle ever since the beginning, grows into a conviction, once that one becomes acquainted with a certain confession contained in book ii. of the "Comment. to Matthew" by Hieronymus. For we find in it the proofs of a deliberate substitution of the whole gospel, the one now in the Canon having been evidently re-written by this too zealous Church Father.[10] He says that he was sent toward the close of the fourth century by "their Felicities," the Bishops Chromatius and Heliodorus to Cæsarea, with the mission to compare the Greek text (the only one they ever had) with the Hebrew original version preserved by the Nazarenes in their library, and to translate it. He translated it, but under protest; for, as he says, the *Evangel* "exhibited matter *not for edification, but for*

---

quently, historical portraiture is, and ever must be, a fatal mode of falsifying and discrediting the Spiritual Reality." (G. Massey, "Gnostic and Historic Christianity.")

[10] This is *history*. How far that *re-writing of*, and tampering with, the primitive gnostic fragments which are now become the New Testament went, may be inferred by reading *Supernatural Religion*, which went through over twenty-three editions, if I mistake not. The host of authorities for it given by the author, is simply appalling. The list of the English and German Bible critics alone seems endless.

destruction. The "destruction" of what? Of the dogma that Jesus of Nazareth and the *Christos* are one—evidently; hence for the "destruction" of the newly planned religion. In this same letter the Saint (who advised his converts to kill their fathers, trample on the bosom that fed them, by walking over the bodies of their mothers, if the parents stood as an obstacle between their sons and Christ)—admits that Matthew did not wish his gospel to be *openly written,* hence that the MS. *was a secret* one. But while admitting also that this gospel "was written in Hebrew characters and *by the hand of himself"* (Matthew), yet in another place he contradicts himself and assures posterity that *as it was tampered with, and re-written by a disciple of Manicheus, named Selecus* . . . "the ears of the Church properly refused to listen to it."

No wonder that the very meaning of the terms *Chréstos* and *Christos,* and the bearing of both on "Jesus of Nazareth," a name coined out of Joshua the *Nazar,* has now become a dead letter for all with the exception of non-Christian Occultists. For even the Kabalists have no original data now to rely upon. The *Zohar* and the Kabala have been remodelled by Christian hands out of recognition; and were it not for a copy of the Chaldean *Book of Numbers* there would remain no better than garbled accounts.

What with several generations of most active Church Fathers ever working at the destruction of old documents and the preparation of new passages to be interpolated in those which happened to survive, there remains of the *Gnostics*—the legitimate offspring of the Archaic Wisdom-religion—but a few unrecognisable shreds. But a particle of genuine gold will glitter for ever; and, however garbled the accounts left by Tertullian and Epiphanius of the Doctrines of the "Heretics," an occultist can yet find even in them traces of those primeval truths which were once universally imparted during the Mysteries of Initiation. Among other works with most suggestive allegories in them, we have still the so-called *Apocryphal Gospels,* and the last discovered as the most precious relic of Gnostic literature, a fragment called *Pistis-Sophia,* "Knowledge-Wisdom."

Those who translate *Pistis* by "Faith," are utterly wrong. The word "faith" as *grace* or something to be believed in through unreasoned or blind faith, is a word that dates only since Christianity. Nor has Paul ever used this term in this sense in his Epistles; and Paul was undeniably—an INITIATE.

YOUTH FORUM

Karma is a word so familiar to students of Theosophy that it may seem unnecessary to elaborate on its meaning. However, Mr. Judge speaks of it as "one of the most important of the laws of nature, [and] so comprehensive in its sweep that it is only by paraphrase and copious explanation that one can convey its meaning in English." If the action of Karma is so universal as to be equated with cause and effect, why should there be difficulty in understanding its operation?

There are numerous synonyms for the idea of Karma. There is also a kind of psychological comfort which comes from feeling that one "knows" the meaning of such a universal doctrine. But a doctrine and its attendant explanations are not meant to short-circuit experience or self-discovery. There are orderly means for the study of the workings of Karma.

The three general classes of Karma discussed by H. P. Blavatsky and William Q. Judge exemplify the complexities and depth of ideas which, on the surface, seem simple to comprehend. Yet a student's self-confident understanding may quickly fade when he realizes that most Theosophical ideas are aspects of this ultimate *Law*. First there are those causes created in the past, which are not able to affect our lives because of other, more dominant forces blocking their operation. The complexity of this backlog of unexpended karma is a reason for the unpredictability of the future. Ignorant of the ways of karma, said H. P. Blavatsky, one portion of mankind calls it "Providence, dark and intricate; while another sees . . . the action of blind fatalism; and a third, simple chance, with neither gods nor devils to guide them." On the brink of good and bad fortune, some men stand with fear, some with indifference, and some with perfect equanimity. Unexpended Karma tempers human plans and sets necessary limits to all but the most philosophical visions of growth and progress.

The second class of Karma deals, Mr. Judge says, with "that Karma which we are now making or storing up by our thoughts and acts, and which will operate in the future when the appropriate body, mind, and environment are taken up by the incarnating Ego in some other life, or whenever obstructive karma is removed." Similar to that of unexpected Karma, this category of possible action establishes the prevailing current of men's lives—the inexplicable tendencies and personal characteristics which distinguish one individual from another.

The third class of Karmic action has to do with the life and experiences which we are now undergoing. It represents the form of encounter available to us now, as appropriate to our need; it explains the necessities of a man living this present life, so that he may say to himself, "it is just what I in fact desired."

These classes of Karma represent all that can be discovered and understood in Nature and a man's life. And when we consider that in this philosophy, every act is generated by a thought, the use of the imagination and man's ability to adapt his thoughts to his plastic potency become vital aids to the processes of growth and maturation.

"Karma," says the *Glossary,* "is the power that controls all things, the resultant of moral action, or the moral effect of an act committed for the attainment of something which gratifies a personal desire. There is the Karma of merit and the Karma of demerit. Karma neither punishes nor rewards, it is simply *the one* Universal Law which guides all other laws productive of certain effects along the grooves of their respective causations."

on the lookout

The "Binding" Conception

The need of Christian scholars to have something "special" in their faith, even in these days of extreme ecumenicalism, is illustrated by a review in the London *Times Literary Supplement* for Sept. 29, 1966. The work under discussion is *Ostliche Meditation und Christliche Mystik* (*Eastern Meditation and Christian Mysticism*) by Fr. Heinrich Dumoulin. After pointing out that the Jesuit scholar's analysis of Zen mystical experience in terms of "Catholic mystical theology with its distinction between nature and grace, natural and supernatural," cannot be anything more than "verbal rigmarole to the Zen Buddhist and indeed to any Buddhist," the reviewer adds:

> In spite of his immense good will and his genuine desire to see the very best in Chinese and Buddhist Zen, Fr. Dumoulin remains bound (with the Buddhist overtones that word invokes) by his Jesuit upbringing which enables him to be patronizing while at the same time quite sincerely disclaiming and condemning any such attitude. He is bound above all by the concept of "personality," the meaning of which he refrains from explaining, and by the unwarranted and typically Western assumption that human personality has value—according to orthodox Christianity, both Catholic and Protestant, "infinite" value, whatever that may mean.

"The One Great Fetter"

Now comes a comment of such penetration that one is surprised to find it in a newspaper—even the London *Times*:

> If Christianity claims to be, like Buddhism, a religion of self-giving, then the sooner the Christians admit that "self" or "personality," however defined, is the one great fetter that "binds" and prevents the influx of the Infinite, the better. This applies as much to Teilhard de Chardin as it does to Fr. Dumoulin. "Personality," we are told, is quite different from "individuality" which, as all mystics agree, must be transcended. Is it?—and if so in what way? Let us hope that questions like these are receiving serious attention in the new Secretariat for Non-Christian religions in Rome.

Even with the tinge of Theravada skepticism in the reviewer's questioning, his point seems well made. Meanwhile, we may recall the similar point made two years ago by Theodore Roszak, who reviewed in the *Nation* (Jan. 11, 1965) a paperback edition of *Love Declared* by Denis de Rougement. Here, again, is the idolization of personality or "the person." Roszak remarks:

> Using his own "philosophy of the person" (which he considers authentically Christian) and this opposing philosophical yellow peril [of Eastern rejection of the personality], he [de Rougement] quixotically divides the world, half and half. Then, to the Christian conception of the person, he traces all things good, including industrial progress, while to the Orient's conception of the "transitory ego" he assigns stagnation and poor hygiene.

"Members of One Another"

Mr. Roszak is agnostic in respect to immortality, as is the Theravada Buddhist, although in the Western scientific tradition. Yet his final criticism is nonetheless effective:

> The traditional Christian conception of the soul—that irreducible, indestructible atomic particle of uniform identity—is not only something men must struggle to spare from eternal perdition (hence, perhaps, our strenuous fear of death). It is as well something we must constantly and laboriously sweat to isolate from the unitary flow of experience and from the ecological field of nature in which we participate. It is this obsession with keeping the ego concentrated and well-defined, this refusal to recognize that reality *is* a web of relations that makes all things "members of one another," that vitiates so many of our human and natural relations. . . . What de Rougement does not recognize is the great therapeutic and moral value of the Buddhist critique of the self.

Antagonism to Buddhist Rationalism

Without the thread-soul of Oriental thought—the continuity of *consciousness* from one embodiment to the next—Christian thinkers are under the necessity of inventing some source of ultimate value, and the idea of the "infinitely precious" created personality seems to have been the result. The more philosophical conception of Buddhism is an obvious threat, since it refuses to take refuge in either supernaturalism or irrationalism. So, judging from these reviews, there is a clear tendency on the part of Christian scholars to denigrate the Eastern doctrine. As for the Theravada (Hinayana)

denial of even spiritual individuality, Edward Conze, in *Buddhism: Its Essence and Development,* seems to think that the Theravadins are ninety-nine per cent right, at least on the practical grounds that the higher egoity which survives could hardly be understood by those whose sense of self is limited to the personality. As Conze says: "Mr. John Smith, turned immortal, would not recognize himself at all. He would have lost everything that made him recognizable to himself and others."

The Mystery of Stonehenge

Howard Fast offers some interesting speculations in his article on Stonehenge for the *Saturday Review* (Feb. 4). As might be expected, Mr. Fast's description gives the reader not only a vivid picture of the dolmen but projects a sense of its mystery. Although all dolmens are related, he says, Stonehenge is unlike any other group of dolmens in the world. "One does not simply look at it; one partakes of it, recognizes it, and knows why it is there without knowing at all."

Conventional religious interpretations, Mr. Fast believes, have not contributed to an understanding of Stonehenge. "Certainly," he says,

> Stonehenge was connected with the religious practices of the people who built it—just as a computer is connected with the social and industrial life of our own society. . . . They were building a machine of sorts—a calculator, a calendar, a bridge for their dreams or a new doorway into the unknown. But they were not building a senseless tribute to superstition. That is the main thing.

Who Built Stonehenge?

A willingness to look beyond familiar answers is shown in the following passage:

> It means nothing to say that Stonehenge was a temple used for religious purposes, for when it was built, there was no separation between man and his religion and his life and work. All were one. It was once thought that Stonehenge was a Druid temple, used for strange rites and human sacrifice, but the people who built Stonehenge were long dead and gone when the Druids first came upon the scene.
>
> As to who built Stonehenge, there, too, all the authorities are less than specific. . . . Those who built Stonehenge left only Stonehenge and some barrows and dolmens, no history or record or explanation.

The similarity between Stonehenge and the Lion Gate in the ruins of Mycenae suggested to Mr. Fast that a Greek architect may have gone to Britain in Homeric times and directed the work at Stonehenge. The similarity of structure, however, is susceptible of another interpretation. Recent issues of Lookout have brought together information linking Atlantean civilization with that of ancient Crete, and *The Secret Doctrine* (II, 341, 343) gives Stonehenge an Atlantean origin:

> Had there been no giants to move about such colossal rocks, there could never have been a Stonehenge, a Carnac (Brittany) and other such Cyclopean structures. . . . These "hinging stones" of Salisbury Plain [Stonehenge] are believed to be the remains of a Druidical temple. But the Druids were historical men and not Cyclopes, nor giants. Who then, *if not giants, could ever raise such masses* (especially those at Carnac and West Hoadley), range them in such symmetrical order that they should represent the planisphere, and place them in such wonderful equipoise that they seem to hardly touch the ground, are set in motion at the slightest touch of the finger, and would yet resist the efforts of twenty men who should attempt to displace them. We say, that most of these stones are the relics of the last Atlanteans.

"Interrelationship of Man and the Universe"

Two final paragraphs show Mr. Fast's freedom from anthropological dogmatism:

> In the world of ancient man religion was something quite different than it is today. It was not a thing for Sunday, church, holy days, or respectability; or a matter of faith or sin or forgiveness. It was something else that we have forgotten—the interrelationship of man and the universe—the beat of the universe and man's response to it. Stonehenge is a measure of this beat, an instrument, a tool, a vast clock. Not a clock of minutes and hours to mark off an indecent race with time, but a clock of days and months, of seasons and years. . . .
>
> There are two ways of looking at ancient man. Colored by our own racial prejudices, by all the lies and nonsense we have absorbed about primitive people in our own historic time, we can look back on ancient man as a sort of superstitious savage who acted senselessly and blindly and did nothing very much that made sense in our own scientific and pseudoscientific terms. On the other hand, we can regard ancient man objectively, observe how well he organized his own society, consider the longevity of his civilizations, examine his skill as architect and engineer and artist, and come to the conclusion that he was quite

a fellow—with a great deal that we have lost, not only in terms of his knowledge of the world, but in terms of his knowledge of himself and his relationship to the universe.

Moral Dilemma of Euthanasia

Articles in the *Christian Century* for Dec. 7, 1966, on the subject of euthanasia, by two contributors, illustrate moral dilemmas which seem totally unresolvable under the circumstances of Kali Yuga. The obligations of the physician's Hippocratic oath to prolong life as well as he can are ranged against such cases as that of a man with irretrievable brain damage who was kept alive in a coma for eight years. Then there is the case of the woman who, although she abhorred the prospect of slow deterioration before death, had somehow been made to survive for thirty years "by repeated surgery and protracted care." One solution is offered in the form of a "panel" of judges which would take testimony and then decide whether death should be caused or allowed. A grave rhetoric attends these discussions, and a serious show of moral principles, yet the decisions cannot in the nature of things be satisfactory. Indeed, there is no easily acceptable solution to be found for dilemmas which have their origin in attitudes assumed long before the time of confrontation.

Karmic Heritage

Unnatural death can only be the result of unnatural life. The treating of the organism as precious beyond all measure is not a true interpretation of the Hippocratic oath, and the maintenance in the body of a spark of physical existence no higher than that of a vegetable becomes "duty" only for those who have been taught to think of medicine as the culture of organs. Our civilization is disproportionately afflicted by the inroads of degenerative disease and the only fruitful treatment of such ills may be seen to lie, finally, on another plane than the physical. Nor can there be any immediate remedy for exactions of Karma which seem to afflict entire races with penalties that call, instead, for new views of both life and death. We can only say that lives lived out of regard for the immortal occupant of the body might be expected to bring a more natural release from the body when its usefulness is done. The problem of what to do about a body condemned to unrelieved suffering until death might be regarded as the inevitable karmic inheritance of a culture which devotes an excess of attention to bodies *per se*, as though they were

all that we are. One may hope that such extreme cases as those discussed in the *Christian Century* may lead, in time, to a wondering about larger, philosophical questions.

Death's Eloquence

The Theosophist's concern for the full experience of the ego would doubtless turn him away from any application of euthanasia in relation to himself or those entrusted to his care—how could he know enough to decide about the time of death for anyone? And the student's choice of medical measures might naturally avoid those which promise mere physical survival, with no intelligence remaining on the scene. Yet he would hardly prescribe a decision for those with other views, nor make judgments about what they do, although he might, if asked, speak of the philosophical issues which are involved, in terms of Karma and reincarnation. What is at issue, also, is the encounter with "just, eloquent, and mighty death." How shall death be met, and its eloquence understood? These are the principles, but their application, except for those who have profound faith in them, remains obscure.

"Things are more Complicated than they Appear to be"

This is the conclusion reached by Dr. Gibson Reaves, of the University of Southern California (according to the Los Angeles *Times*, Dec. 5, 1966), when his studies of dwarf galaxies showed that they do not always follow one of the most firmly established laws of physics—that of "the equipartition of energy." According to this law, the larger galaxies in any cluster would tend to collect in the middle. Dr. Reaves' study of photographs of four galactic clusters, however, revealed that, while two galaxies act in accordance with this law, two others (Virgo and Canes Venetici) do not. In these, the large and dwarf galaxies are "more or less evenly dispersed." (Dwarf galaxies are fainter than brighter ones, not because they are farther away, but because they are smaller and more diffused.) Dr. Reaves concluded, then, that the law of equipartition of energy "is not as inexorable as scientists have thought," adding:

> But the galaxies are obeying some law, that we can be sure of. The bright galaxies in a cluster may be exploding ones, shooting out or "giving birth" to the dwarfs. The force of these explosions may be overcoming the gravity that otherwise would draw the galaxies toward the central part of the star system.
>
> One begins by assuming that known natural laws apply . . .

but one always hopes to fail too. To explain the unknown in terms of the known isn't all-important. It's important to find new laws, not merely to affirm old ones.

Explanation Needed

Dr. Reaves compares the situation in astronomy today to that of biology before Darwin: "a hodgepodge of bits and pieces of theory and speculation." Some "brilliant explanation" is needed, he says, that will systematize the information at hand. In *The Secret Doctrine* (I, 586), H. P. Blavatsky points to the philosophy of the ancients for synthesis. She writes:

> Inductive Science, in its Branches of Astronomy, Physics, and Chemistry, while advancing timidly towards the conquest of Nature's secrets in her final effects on our terrestrial plane, recedes to the days of Anaxagoras and the Chaldees in its discoveries of (a) the origin of our phenomenal world, and (b) the modes of formation of the bodies that compose the universe. And having to turn back for their cosmogonical hypotheses to the beliefs of the earliest philosophers, and the systems of the latter —systems that were all based on the teachings of a universal secret doctrine with regard to the primeval matter with its properties, functions, and laws,—have we not the right to hope that the day is not far off when Science will show a better appreciation of the wisdom of the ancients than it has hitherto done?
>
> No doubt Occult philosophy could learn a good deal from exact modern science; but the latter, on the other hand, might profit by ancient learning in more than one way, and chiefly in Cosmogony.

A Platter of Lies

Some notice—but not much—must be given to a recent book, *Spirits, Stars—and Spells* (Canaveral Press, 1966), by L. Sprague De Camp and his wife Catherine, in which there is a chapter which revives all the old calumnies of H. P. Blavatsky and, without even pretense of inspection of its philosophic content, holds Theosophy up to scorn. This sort of book is apparently a mainstay of Mr. De Camp's professional career, since he was also the author of a shallow, flippant book on magic, witchcraft, and occultism, a portion of which appeared in the *Saturday Review of Literature* in 1947. In the section titled "The Meddlesome Mahatmas" in *Spirits,* etc., Mr. and Mrs. De Camp practice the shabby art of ridicule, quoting odd bits from *The Secret Doctrine* for evidence of what they propose is absurdity, and repeating gossip and slander coming from H.P.B.'s bitterest enemies as though all that was said against her had re-

mained undisputed from that day to this. Of the New York *Sun's* retraction of the great body of these lies, after its lawyers could find no "solid foundation" for the allegations it had printed, the De Camps say nothing at all. The measure of responsibility and the level of the interest of these writers may be seen from their charge that H.P.B. was addicted to marijuana throughout her later years and that she died "after a tardy reconciliation with the Russian Orthodox Church." The Hodgson Report is treated as "invincibly detailed, careful, and fair-minded," with no hint of the fact that present members of the London Society for Psychical Research have all but repudiated the glib conclusions of this youthful investigator of seventy years ago, and there is no reference to the exhaustive refutation published in 1963 by Adlai Waterman, under the title, *Obituary: The "Hodgson Report." Spirits, Stars—and Spells* is a completely worthless book, if the methods followed in the chapter on H.P.B. and Theosophy are characteristic of the rest of the "research" in this volume.

Sleep and the Alcoholic

The Los Angeles *Times* (Dec. 28, 1966) reports that a group of doctors from the State University of New York have been studying the effect of alcoholism on normal sleep patterns, and have discovered that drunkenness prolongs the dream state of Stage II from the normal 25 per cent of sleeping time to 100 per cent. This prevents not only the REM stage (IV) but also the delta phase. Thus, the entire cycle of sleep is disrupted. (See "Sleep," Lookout, December, 1966.) One of the group, Dr. Milton Gross, suggests that "sleep disruptions may even be the cause of the alcoholic's psychotic behavior." For example:

> When the drinking ends, or perhaps sooner, the flood of delta and dreaming sleep that has been held back is suddenly released, with frightening results. When dreaming overwhelms deep sleep, the patient experiences the hallucinations of pink elephants and crawling insects instead of the less bizarre normal dream content.
>
> Dr. Gross speculated that the length of time that dreaming sleep dominates and holds back deep sleep may be an accurate indicator of the severity of the alcoholic's condition.

Beyond Clinical Findings

This, of course, only expresses differently, without adding materially to, H.P.B.'s description of the "state of mind of the drunkard

during sleep" (*Transactions,* p. 78). What the studies in sleep have added, is *observable* cyclic changes in quality and depth of sleep, so that it has become evident that not only "sleep" but also the natural rhythms of sleep are necessary for psychic balance and physical well-being. Why?

Here, H.P.B. provides the answer. She says, in effect, that during sleep the "thinking entity" must traverse the inner planes of consciousness through *Swapna* and *Sushupti* to *Turiya,* "the highest state" ("the state of dreamless sleep—a causal condition"), so that "the senses may recuperate and obtain a new lease of life for the *Jagrata,* or waking state." In other words, the Ego during normal sleep returns to its own plane, lives for a time in its *own* environment. This is the essence and culmination of the sleep cycle.

Poltergeists Again

People who are the victims of a poltergeist (noise-ghost) are frequently hesitant about telling of their experiences. But once in a while, usually when police are called in, the stories reach the newspapers. Two such items have come to our notice.

The first (Chicago *Daily News,* Oct. 11, 1966) tells of a family who thought they were "seeing things" when heavy chairs started flying around the room. Finally the sheriff was appealed to, and a deputy sent to the residence. He reported that "a chair in one corner of the living room rose in the air; a picture flew off the wall; and a heavy metal tool box just missed hitting me." When the family went to a relative's to get a good night's rest, things started flying around in *that* home.

Another mischievous ghost began playing games in a Miami warehouse (Los Angeles *Times,* Jan. 18). Police were called in when the activities became so frequent and so violent that business was disrupted. No evidence of vandalism was found, and the proprietor was then informed by his insurance agent that he didn't carry "ghost insurance." This poltergeist was partial to objects made of glass—mugs, glasses, ash trays, and the like. "He's broken at least twenty mugs," said the owner, "and we don't dare leave any glass objects on the shelves. I didn't believe in ghosts—but that was five days ago."

"Physical phenomena are the result of the manipulation of forces through the physical system of the medium, by unseen intelligences of whatever class," says H.P.B. (*Isis* I, 367). And on page 197 of

the same volume: ". . . the force which operates in the presence of a medium upon external objects comes from a source back of the medium himself. . . . This force moves articles of furniture, and performs other manifestations." Apparently, it requires the presence of someone who is consciously or unconsciously, and often temporarily, acting as a "medium" for these forces to manifest themselves.

Warning—Danger Ahead

In addition to the information being amassed about the effects of LSD, including the discovery that it causes actual brain damage, the following specific warning—given by Atty. Gen. Thomas C. Lynch, of California—emphasizes another consequence:

> . . . if you take one dose of LSD and if you have what they call a "horrible trip" and a bad reaction, this will recur at any time *without your ever taking LSD again.* (*Evening Outlook,* Santa Monica, Feb. 11. Our italics.)

One Battle Lost, Another to Follow

On information received from the Religious News Service, a *Christian Century* editorial (Jan. 25) warns that Senator Everett Dirksen will probably introduce in the next Congress a prayer bill that will be "substantially the same" as the one defeated in the last session. He is counting on increased Republican support to make up the nine votes by which his former proposal failed of adoption. As the *Century* sees it:

> If the Senate adopts his bill, the measure would still have to be adopted by the House of Representatives by a two-thirds vote and, within seven years, by three-fourths of the states and then receive presidential approval. . . . The disposition of some Americans who believe in the First amendment and who do not want the public areas of our common life invaded by religion is one of sanguine hope that the Dirksen bill will collapse on its long trip—whether they do anything to defeat it or not. They should not count on that hope. They should tell their senators *now* that they do not want Dirksen or anyone else tampering with the First amendment.